

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/840,157	04/24/2001	Yoshihiko Watanabe	35.C15213	3428	
5514 75	90 09/13/2005	EXAMINER			
FITZPATRIC	K CELLA HARPER	HUNTSINGER, PETER K			
NEW YORK, NY 10112			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2624		
			DATE MAILED: 09/13/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/840,157	WATANABE ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
Peter K. Huntsinger	2624

	Examiner	Artonit					
	Peter K. Huntsinger	2624					
-The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED 8/24/05 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICA	TION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOW	ANCE.					
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Nota a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mo	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)				
 a)	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth						
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7		FIRST REPLY WAS F	ILED WITHIN				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b NOTICE OF APPEAL	dension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as				
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complishing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS. 	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NO		ecause				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	., .		the issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amandment	(DTOL 324)				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s		impliant Amendment	(FTOL-324).				
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).	·	timely filed amendme	ent canceling the				
 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 24-38. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 1-23. 		II be entered and an e	explanation of				
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe ry and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attacl	ned.				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	No(s)					

Application/Control Number: 09/840,157

Art Unit: 2624

Response to Amendment

- 1. The amendment filled on 24 August 2005 has been entered in full.
- 2. Based on the applicant's amendment, the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejections to claims 34-38 have been withdrawn.
- 3. Based on the applicant's amendment, the objection to claim 35 has been withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 24 August 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues on page 7 of the remarks, that:

Kolls does not disclose forming a file utilizing an application and calculating a charge for use of the application on the basis of an amount of the output product recorded by an output log recording means in response to an output request for output processing of the file.

a. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Kolls discloses utilizing an application (col. 6-7, lines 63-67, 1-5). When printing or copying a file is formed to store the image that is printed. For viewing websites, a file is formed when it is received from the internet. Kolls disclose calculating a charge for use of the application (1718 of Fig. 19, col. 39, lines. 62-65), on the basis of an amount of the output product recorded by an output log recording means (60 of Fig. 1, col. 5, lines 19-21). Kolls discloses an output request for output processing of the file

Application/Control Number: 09/840,157 Page 3

Art Unit: 2624

(50 of Fig. 1, col. 5, lines 17-19). The customer makes a selection of the desired good or service. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., calculating a charge **in response** to an output request) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter K. Huntsinger whose telephone number is (571)272-7435. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Moore can be reached on (571)272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 09/840,157

Art Unit: 2624

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PKH

DAVID MOORE SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Vard More

Page 4